

of Labor in H-1B nonimmigrant cases, indicating this simply provides similar investigative authority to the Department of Labor as in labor certification cases, but in this amendment, the DOL can initiate its own investigations. It is given authority under section 556 of title V which it does not have in H-1B cases. There is an array of penalties and remedies that is greater than that in 212. I certainly think it would not be appropriate, and I would speak against it.

Quickly, with regard to the amendment dealing with the "intent standard," I oppose that amendment. I have heard many more horror stories from employers who, when trying in absolute good faith to avoid hiring illegal aliens, have for one reason or another required more documents than the law requires or the wrong documents or fail to honor documents that appear to be genuine.

Here is a common scenario. We often hear scenarios of the aggrieved. Here is one.

A worker initially submits an INS document showing time-limited work authorization. At a later verification, however, the same employee produces documents with no time limitation—for example, a Social Security card—to show work authorization and a driver's license to show identity, both of which the employer knows are widely available in counterfeit form. What is the employer supposed to do?

Under current law, if the employer asks for an INS work authorization, he or she can be fined, for a first offense, up to \$2,000 per individual. Yet, if the employer continues to employ the individual, he or she will be taking the chance of unlawfully hiring an illegal alien. Remember that compliance with the law requires an employer to act in good faith. Would there be good faith under such suspicious circumstances?

Furthermore, in hiring the individual, the employer would be facing the possibility of investing considerable time and resources, including training, in an individual whom the INS might soon force the employer to fire. There is also the loss of the work opportunity for the legal U.S. worker, people we speak of here.

In another example, a college recruiter cannot ask a job applicant, "Do you have work authorization for the next year?" That is discrimination because it would discriminate against asylees or refugees with time-limited work authorization. A recruiter may only ask, "Are you permitted to work full-time?"

Employers cannot even ask an employee what his or her immigration status is. An employer may only ask, "Are you any of the following? But don't tell me which."

I oppose any kind of employment discrimination, always have throughout the whole course of years. Employers who intentionally discriminate in hiring or discharging are breaking the law. Scurrilous. But I do not believe it

fair to fine the employers who are trying in good faith to follow the law.

Under this amendment, law-abiding employers would continue to be threatened with penalties. The amendment says an employer may not ask for different documents, even when the employer has constructive knowledge that the applicant's documents are likely to be false; must reverify an employee if their time-limited work authorization expires, and must accept documents provided; and will be fined for employer sanctions or unfair discrimination unless he or she asks for any specific documents from the alien. This is the same as current law, and I think this is unacceptable.

We will review and discuss it further. I will have further comments. But I believe, under the previous order, that we will now proceed to regular order with the direction of the Chair.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:44 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled vote now occur at 2:45 today under the earlier conditions, and time between now and then be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it had been our intention to start voting at 2:15, but at least one of our colleagues—maybe more—is involved in heavy, heavy traffic and trying to reach the Capitol in time for the votes. We have agreed to set aside those votes. What we are trying to do now, to accommodate our colleagues who cannot reach the Capitol now, is take up a couple of more amendments and have those votes along with the other votes that we have already agreed to.

I think Senator ABRAHAM on our side has an amendment, and we will ask

him to come to the floor and present that amendment. Maybe Senator SIMON on the other side will have an amendment.

REPEAL OF THE GAS TAX

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me also indicate something that it is not a part of this bill. It is still our intention to work out some procedure where we can take up repeal of the 4.3-cent gas tax. That is a matter of about \$4.8 billion per year. It is our intention to repeal it until the end of the year and work on a permanent repeal during the budget process.

We believe, with the skyrocketing prices of gasoline, jet fuel, and other fuels, that the most certain way to give consumers relief is to repeal the gas tax. That was part of the 1993 \$265 billion tax increase President Clinton proposed, which did not receive a single Republican vote in the House or Senate. A permanent repeal of the gas tax is about \$30 billion.

So what we hope to propose, and hopefully on a bipartisan basis, at the appropriate time, is to go ahead and repeal the gas tax for the remainder of this year and try to get this done before the Memorial Day recess and deal with permanent repeal during the budget process. Of course, we would have to find offsets and pay for the repeal. It seems to me that we should do that as quickly as we can before the summer driving season starts in earnest.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know the majority leader wants to get on with the measures. We have been in touch with Senator SIMON and others. I understand Senator SIMON is coming to the floor, and others. I will just mention that, just as the leader wants to get on to the issues in terms of the gas tax, many of us would still like to get on with the issues of the minimum wage increase. That, I think, is something we are all interested in. We are all interested in different matters, and that has been outstanding for some period of time.

As I have indicated earlier, I hope that after we finish all of these amendments, while it is open for amendment, we would at least have the opportunity to offer it under the underlying bill. I know that the majority leader has not looked kindly on that in the past. But I wanted to at least make sure that we all understood at least what we were going to attempt to do.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate to the Senator from Massachusetts that we have discussed not only minimum wage, but maybe even coupling these two items, joining the two, repeal of the gas tax and maybe the minimum wage, some increase. We talked about a lot of different options and we have not reached a decision. I can assure the Senator that he will be one of the first to know once we have reached a resolution.

Mr. BREAUX addressed the Chair.